

## CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY

## COUNCIL OF THE FACULTY OF ARTS AND SCIENCE

Minutes of the meeting held on Friday, February 1, 1985

*See doc.*

Present: R. M. Roy, Chairman; D. Taddeo; J. Chaikelson; M. Singer; J. Princz; C. Barton; C. Bertrand; A. Broes; R. Cronin, s.j.; D. Dicks; M. Doughty; J. Doyle; J. Drysdale; H. Shulman; C. Langford; J. Locke; D. Markiewicz; D. McDougall; S. McEvenue S. Misra; G. Newsham; M. Oppenheim; R. Pallen; H. Proppe; E. Raudsepp; E. Saccá; B. Sahni; O. Schwelb; W. Sellers; G. Valaskakis; L. Van Toch; J. Young; S. Byer; L. Gray; D. Konig; A. Legault; D. Marjama; D. Vlassopoulos; M. Trepanier; M. Patenaude; B. St. Laurent.

Absent with Regrets: G. Trudel; H. Perlman; S. Cappelli.

Guests: G. Boyd; A. Melamed.

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 1:35 p.m.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Approval of the agenda was moved by Prof. McEvenue, seconded by Prof. Pallen.

Vote: Carried

3. CHAIRMAN'S REMARKS

The Chairman informed the members of Faculty Council that he would defer his remarks concerning the resolutions of Council which were forwarded to the Board of Governors until the item on the restructuring of the Faculty was taken up.

Dean Roy announced that the Arts and Science Faculty Council meeting to consider the Graduation List has been set for Wednesday, May 22, 1985 at 9:30 a.m.

The Chairman said that he had been notified of Ms. Schuhmacher's resignation from the Faculty Curriculum Committee and the resignation of Mr. Paré from Faculty Council although he has not as yet received written confirmation of the latter. He gave notice that an election will be held at the next meeting to fill the position on the Curriculum Committee.

#### 4. QUESTIONS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman was asked, in the absence of the Registrar's representative, if he could provide any information concerning the view from the Registrar's Office about Arts and Science's advance registration; that the Faculty has been given the last period for early registration, May and June, while Engineering, Commerce, and Fine Arts have been assigned April and early May. It was thought that the Faculty ought to protest.

Dean Roy replied that he shared the faculty member's concern but did not know all the details. However, given that Arts and Science is the largest Faculty it does seem strange that it is being given the left-over time slots.

It was reported that the three Assistant Deans had met with Mr. Smart and Ms. Tarlton concerning early registration and prior to that had been given some new registration procedures and asked to consult with Chairmen on the changes. When they were called to the meeting it was found that, to their surprise and that of the other Assistant Deans, all dates and procedures had been established. Registration is to start on March 21st (it cannot start earlier because Birks Hall has been booked for intramural sports) and Commerce, Engineering, and Fine Arts has reserved all the time up to the beginning of April after which time examinations and summer registration take place leaving only May and June for early registration for Arts and Science. Letters have been sent which recommend that the time up to early April should be assigned on a proportional basis for all Faculties and that unless that happens Arts and Science will not get involved with early registration but will register in August and will restrict the Arts and Science courses to Arts and Science students until they have been registered.

Dean Taddeo supported that position and added that Vice-Rector Martin has been asked whether or not Arts and Science can have access to Birks Hall in early March. He stressed that this practice is not in keeping with Faculty Council's resolution of two years ago that there be decentralized online registration for Arts and Science effective June 1, 1984. No reply has been received.

Asked what happened to Faculty Council's resolutions concerning the restructuring of the Faculty at the Board of Governors meeting, Dean Roy replied that he was not present at the meeting and could only repeat what the Rector and others had told him. The resolutions of Council were given to the Rector on Wednesday morning following the Faculty Council meeting and a letter was sent to the Secretary of the Board, together with a copy of the resolutions, asking that they be distributed to the members of the Board at the meeting. As far as he could tell both the Rector and the Secretary of the Board agreed to the request and they were to have been distributed. However, the Rector indicated that in fact it was only after the passage of the Rector's document that it was learned that the resolutions of Council were not on the table. This fact was attributed to a slip-up in the office of the Secretary and perhaps due to the late arrival of the resolutions. Some copies of the resolutions were then distributed around the table but there were not enough for everyone. The question was reopened at least for some sort of discussion but there was really no sentiment of the Board to change the resolutions that had been passed.



Dean Roy said that the Rector had assured him that the two substantive issues, the elections procedures and the number of Vice-Deans, were addressed by him in his presentation of his document; that he chose not to support the Council's recommendation regarding the number of Deans, but did in some way discuss the elections procedures which resulted in the three changes that were made in the final version of the document. After reading the changes to the document Dean Roy suggested that, since one of the key issues to be discussed under the topic of Restructuring of the Faculty was the question of the election procedures, further debate on the issues could be taken up later on the agenda. After some further discussion Council members reluctantly agreed to move on to the next item on the agenda.

5. INTRODUCTION TO COMPUTER USAGE IN ARTS AND SCIENCE (INTE C300) - Progress Report (ASFC 85-2-D1)

Dean Roy indicated that the document number was missing from Prof. Boyd's report on Computer Usage in the Arts and Science and asked the members of Faculty Council to add the number ASFC 85-2-D1 to the upper right-hand corner. Then he invited Prof. Boyd to say a few words about his report.

Prof. Boyd informed Council members that his memorandum was a month old and that several developments occurred almost immediately after it was written. There are now one hundred and five students in the programme and an additional \$4,500.00 has been budgeted for teaching assistants to cover some of the immediate needs. He thought the course was doing remarkably well considering this type of course is normally developed over a year with a budget of \$150,000.00 while we have developed it over five months with a fraction of that budget. He said that the lab facilities have been developed largely by Paul McGuire of the Audio-Visual Department with the aid of resources from the Vice-Rector Administration, and the course itself has been largely put together by Andrew McAusland, course manager.

It was noted that the Computer Science sub-committee of U.C.C.C. recommended at its last meeting, at the request of the Faculty of Fine Arts, that a certain number of Fine Arts students be allowed to register (15-20%) with a pro rata cost charging agreement and it was asked if any Fine Arts students were in the course. Prof. Boyd replied that there are several students in the course but at present there is no cost-sharing arrangement because the course is in the development stage.

Asked if he had arrived at a method for evaluating the course as had been requested last Spring Prof. Boyd said that a diary is being kept of what is happening in the course, that an attempt is being made to evaluate the cost-effectiveness of the course, the satisfaction of the students, but that the project has not been completed.

The Chairman thanked Prof. Boyd for the role he has played in getting the course off the ground, for riding with it through the term, and for his report to Council.

6. PROPOSALS CONCERNING GENERAL EDUCATION (ASFC 85-1-D3)

The Chairman noted that Item 6 on the agenda had been carried over from the last meeting and that in addition to the document distributed for that meeting, ASFC 85-1-D3, there were two earlier documents, ASFC 84-5-D1 and 85-5-D2, presented at the May meeting of Council last Spring. He asked Prof. Drysdale to report on his document, Proposals Concerning General Education, and to give some background which lead up to his proposals now before Council.

Assistant Dean Drysdale informed Faculty Council that each year since the Cohen Report was issued five years ago there has been a different committee established whose main task has been to prepare some proposals to develop general education. The fact that Council is committed to general education is demonstrated by its resolution of May, 1984 which states "be it resolved that the Council of the Faculty of Arts and Science endorse the principle of general education as outlined in section II-C of the Report of the Task Force on Core Curricula as a valuable complement to specialized study in the programme of concentration for all Arts and Science Students", but feasibility problems have hindered the resolution from being realized. Prof. Drysdale said that it was clear that at the end of the round-table discussion last May that members of Council were sharply divided between those who thought that it was feasible to go ahead under the terms proposed and those who had one or more serious concerns about the feasibility of implementing the proposals brought to Council. During this academic year he has had the occasion to bring together the members from last year's committee who are members of Council, including Prof. Broes who last year submitted a minority report, and as a result of those meetings he prepared this most recent document which he considers to be a much more modest proposal and hoped would be perceived to be an entirely reasonable and careful approach to the development of any programmes in general education.

85-2-2 It was moved and seconded (Drysdale/Oppenheim) that Council approve the establishment of a committee on general education with the composition and mandate as indicated in Document ASFC 85-1-D3.

It was said that the proposal before Council was the right kind of document and appreciation was expressed for the fact that the reservations of a number of members of Council had been taken into account in the preparation of the resolutions in the report.

A vote was taken on the motion and it was carried.

85-2-3 It was moved and seconded (Drysdale/Pallen) that the one-month notice of elections be waived in order to elect members to the Committee on General Education at this meeting.

Some objections were raised to waiving the usual notice of election and the validity of the statement by Prof. Drysdale that if the committee is to do anything before the end of the year it needs to be mandated as soon as possible in order to meet the implied direction in the report to submit its recommendations to Council in May 1985, and the Chairman was asked if indeed he thought this an urgent matter or if in fact Council



is moving away from what has been a pretty strict adherence to the one-month notion.

The Chairman replied that he is in favour of the notice of elections but in fairness to Prof. Drysdale it should be said that he did submit the document to Council for the January meeting; that we did not reach that point on the agenda and it is unfortunate that the month was lost.

The motion was voted on and it was carried.

85-2-4 Prof. Drysdale nominated Prof. S. McEvenue, Chairman of Theological Studies, (Humanities), Prof. G. Dewey, Chairman of Sociology (Social Sciences), and Prof. H. Proppe, Chairman of Mathematics (Natural Sciences), and Robert Lachance, nominated by CUSA. The nominations were seconded by Ms. Konig.

It was noted that two members of the committee are from the Sociology Department, Prof. Dewey and the Chairman, and that Prof. Broes might be asked to to serve on the committee in place of Prof. Dewey. He declined the offer.

85-2-5 It was moved and seconded (Konig/Pallen) to close nominations thereby electing four members to the General Education Committee. Vote: Carried

7. SCIENCE AND HUMAN AFFAIRS (ASFC 85-1-D4, ASFC 85-1-D5)

The Chairman drew attention to two documents concerning Science and Human Affairs, ASFC 85-1-D4, prepared by Asst. Dean Drysdale for Vice-Rector Breen last May, and ASFC 85-1-D5, Report of the Management Committee on Science and Human Affairs prepared by Prof. Langford for the Management Committee which was established by the Acting Provost last summer.

Prof. Drysdale commented briefly on his report, Science and Human Affairs at Concordia, a Report on the Current Status and Future Prospective for Programme Development in SCHA and said that he had no idea that the report was to appear in Council since it had been prepared at the request of the Vice-Rector Academic. He said that a case has been made in the report for the retention of SCHA and the development of it in certain possible directions and that the recommendations contained in it are consistent with the previous two reports. He named the four reports on the topic which have been written since 1981-82 and said that all the reports support the maintenance, retention, or even the augmentation of faculty resources for it, particularly full-time faculty support. The fact that there is no serious difference of approach in all documents suggests that there is a consistency that is worth recognizing in Council as it looks at the documents. Prof. Drysdale pointed out that there has been a steady attrition of faculty resources in the programme to the point that there is not now a full-time appointment. He called attention to the fact admissions have been frozen for a year and that these crucial factors lead him to believe that without definite Council action SCHA will die shortly. He concluded his remarks by outlining five suggestions contained in the report on which he thought Council might want to take some action.

Provost Singer noted that although admissions to the programme are frozen, a complete selection of courses have been scheduled for next year. He then outlined the financial implications of developing the programme as outlined and explained why he did not believe that it can be floated as it currently

stands with less than two full-time positions. He said that he could only support the programme if Faculty Council is prepared to give it the highest priority in the Faculty but he could not support a band-aid financing of the project that would allow us to do nothing well.

Mr. Gray said that in addition to being a student representative on Faculty Council he was also President of the Science and Human Affairs Association and that the Association had taken it upon itself to circulate a petition, a copy of which was made available to the Secretary, and he wished to have it minuted with the following words, "we the undersigned students support the continuation of the Science and Human Affairs Programme. We protest all attempts to undermine its credibility, whether by freezing admissions or by eliminating resources." He said that the 234 signatories are Engineering students and Division IV students who would be directly affected by the Langford Proposal. With regard to the admissions freeze he said that the Thornton Report put emphasis on the administrative ambiguity of the programme and its recommendations were primarily towards rectifying this ambiguity more than an immediate curriculum change of the programme although that was foreseen in the report. The students do not feel that the freeze was justified since the programme is still being offered and had it not been frozen students would by this time have been two-thirds through it. He added that the Association does support the proposal before Council.

Prof. Schwelb said that he fully supported the idea that we should have a full department of Science and Human Affairs. He considered it ironic that Concordia should be without such a department especially today when environmental issues are so very important and he thought that the department, regardless of what Faculty it is attached to, should serve the whole University. He noted that one of the requirements for accreditation in Engineering is a number of courses in engineering and social aspects.

Prof. Langford was asked to present his report to Faculty Council, Proposal for Development of Science and Human Affairs (ASFC 85-1-D5). He said that he first came into contact with the Concordia programme in Science and Human Affairs when he was at Carlton University and Chairman of the Committee on Science, Technology, and Environment, a programme somewhat less ambitious than Concordia's at that time, but which shared many parallel concerns, not the least of which was the one expressed by Prof. Schwelb that it was interested in a wider range of clients than simply the Faculty of Arts and Science. From the perspective of Carlton the programme at Concordia was the model and the leader in Canada. When he and his committee was asked to take on the task of functioning as a management committee they took it to be the task of bringing the various propositions that were under discussion and the various points of view related to the situation of the programme together in a form that would allow for the resolution of the question of the future of the programme. He said that whether we continue the programme or not the University is going to make a substantial investment in resources in the area, as had been pointed out the Faculty of Engineering for its accreditation requires a significant amount of resources to be devoted to material which currently overlaps with the activities of SCHA, which according to Prof. McQueen a member of the Management Committee is 50%. He noted that there are several members of the Faculty whose major scholarly commitments are already in the field of Science and Human Affairs and if we do



not have a programme and and centre those activities will tend to be uncoordinated, ill-focused, and may well produce a situation in which those particular faculty members in fact find in a disciplinary environment inadequate appreciation of their scholarly contributions. His guess about resource implications for the programme would be a single faculty position to find the person who would give direction and focus to the activity if a suitable interfaculty structure can be established and given a proper administrative home.

85-2-6

It was moved and seconded (Langford/Pallen) that: a) the Drysdale Report be accepted; b) the Science and Human Affairs programmes be continued; this recommendation is contingent upon the establishment of a suitable unit which can, in addition, gather together under its management the teaching requirement in this area of Division III, Division IV, and the Faculty of Engineering; and c) it is recommended to Senate that it establish a committee to recommend a suitable administrative structure to realize the objectives of part b) of this resolution.

Asked what was the implication of "accepting" the Drysdale Report Prof. Langford explained that the intention of the Management Committee was to invite the Council to approve of the content of the report as an analysis of the status of the programme.

Dean Roy clarified the situation further by saying that he saw the report as presenting alternatives, not a single motion or a single course of action and in a sense in accepting it we would be accepting the data upon which the second report is based, but he did not see Council as committing itself by accepting the report.

It was pointed out that some of the recommendations contained in the Drysdale Report are in contradiction with the motion on the floor, therefore, part a) should be changed from "accepted" to "received" and in doing that it would form the history referred to by Prof. Langford.

It was agreed that the new wording would be incorporated into the motion.

Prof. Melamed, Coordinator of the Urban Studies Programme, was given speaking privileges. He noted that Urban Studies was not included in either of the reports before Council and gave the history of his association with the programme since 1976. He made a plea for the continuation of Science and Human Affairs, not as it used to be in the halcyon days or what it has come down to, but as a programme which could gain much more respect in the future by focusing not on the history of science but on what happens when you have scientists working without any concern for the environment. He stressed that there are now more students enrolled in the Science and Human Affairs Programme than in certain other departments.

Prof. Langford noted that one of the net benefits that was called to the attention of the Committee concerning the development of a coherent and cross-faculty unit would be that this is an area which increasingly is one in which public agencies have specific concerns and there is a possibility that such a unit could respond to the initiative; the Budget Task Force may ask how could the University generate new sources of revenue. One Distinct possibility of new sources of revenue is contractual activities in the area of technology appraisal and science technology.

Prof. Drysdale asked for confirmation of his understanding that if the recommendations bog down in either Senate or in negotiations with the Faculty of Engineering it does not mean that we are then to abandon all of our commitment within this Faculty to the programme.

Prof. Langford stated that if the management committee continues in its present function, which is not perfectly clear to him at this time, it would be his view that if it failed it would come back to the Council for further guidance.

A vote was taken on those in favour of the motion (as edited) and it was carried.

#### 8. RESTRUCTURING OF THE FACULTY OF ARTS AND SCIENCE

The Chairman declared that although there are a number of important items to be discussed under the general topic of the restructuring of the Faculty it seemed to him that the most urgent one at the moment was to resolve the dilemma of the elections procedures for the search committee for the new Dean. Other things to be considered are: 1) the motion that was tabled at the last meeting for revision by Steering Committee (ASFC 85-2-D2); 2) a series of questions in the form of a resolution from Prof. White from the Psychology Department, who was unable to be at the meeting, concerning items about proceedings of the Board of Governors (ASFC 85-2-D3); and 3) the subsequent reporting about the Council and Board resolutions by The Thursday Report.

Dean Roy reviewed the events that have occurred since the last Faculty Council meeting. He read the composition of the search committee for the new Dean of the Faculty as given in the Rector's document on the restructuring of the Faculty, the decisions taken by Council at its last meeting on how it wished to conduct the election of its members to the search committee, and the revisions made in the composition of the committee at the meeting of the Board of Governors on January 17th. He noted that Council's resolution that "the four faculty members on the search committee for the new Dean be elected faculty-wide on the basis of one representative from each Division" and which was later interpreted to mean that the election would take place within each Division with only members of that Division voting, was seen by the Board of Governors as being at variance with its amended version which says, "four full-time faculty members from Arts and Science, each to be elected by a secret ballot of all the faculty". The Chairman said that he would like to structure the debate around a letter he received from the Elections Committee.

Provost Singer read the four questions raised by the Elections Committee and then informed the members of Council of the election schedule which would have to be followed in order to meet the February 20th deadline: four to four and one-half days for the call for nominations which will be due on February 8th, ballots distributed on the 11th and returned by 4:00 p.m. on February 15th.

In reviewing the situation Dean Taddeo stated that there is no doubt the



Arts and Science Faculty did adopt a specific motion in January concerning the mode of voting for its representatives on the search committee. In the same way there is no disputing that the Board of Governors adopted an entirely different motion and Faculty Council has the choice of accepting the resolution of the University's supreme authority or to follow its own resolution, but he was not sure what legislative, legal, or moral implications the latter route would have on the Board of Governors resolutions. In an attempt to reconcile the two resolutions Dean Taddeo proposed the following motion:

85-2-7

- (Taddeo/Pallen)
- a) that all full-time faculty in the Arts and Science Faculty participate in electing each of the four Arts and Science representatives to the Search Committee for the Dean of the Arts and Science Faculty;
  - b) that there be one representative from each of the four Divisions in the Faculty of Arts and Science;
  - c) that eligibility be the same as that which governed the election for representatives of the Vice-Rector Search Committee in 1984;
  - d) that the method of selection will be by preferential vote.

Provost Singer read the regulations which governed the elections for the representatives of the Search Committee for the Vice-Rector in 1984 and he explained how the counting of ballots under the preferential scheme was done in that election.

A lengthy discussion followed which centered around the merits of preferential voting versus simple plurality and to what extent voters ought to be required to rank the candidates.

85-2-7

It was moved and seconded (Langford/Valaskakis) to amend section d) of the motion to limit the ranking up to a maximum of three candidates.

It was asked that separate ballots be used for each Division.

It was agreed that voting on the motion should be clause by clause.

A this point in the meeting the discussion reverted back to the action of the Board of Governors and the recommendation was made that Faculty Council should react to what happened and should, perhaps, consider the resolutions submitted by Prof. White. Faculty Council members supported the notion that some kind of protest ought to be sent to the Board, but that the immediate problem of how to conduct the elections should be settled first.

Prof. Doyle called the question on the motion. Each section of the motion was read before a vote was taken.

Vote on Section a) Carried

Vote on Section b) Carried

Vote on Section c) Carried

When section d) of the motion was read prior to the vote being taken a number of questions were asked in an attempt to further clarify the motion.

Prof. Proppe did not think that to limit the ranking of candidates to three in any way simplifies the system and he explained why. He outlined the advantages of allowing voters to rank up to the maximum number of candidates on the ballot.

85-2-9

Prof. Proppe moved to amend section c) to replace the ranking of up to three candidates to "up to the maximum, with suitable instructions and guidelines to make it clear to the voters that they do not have to rank every single candidate, but they do have to vote in unbroken sequence".

His sub-amendment was seconded by Prof. Drysdale.

A vote taken on the sub-amendment resulted in a tie which was broken by the Chairman who voted in favour of the amendment.

The motion as amended was voted on and it was carried.

Attention was drawn to the two articles which appeared in The Thursday Report on the action of Council. Provost Singer said that he wished to congratulate the members of the paper because in the January 17th issue there is an incredibly accurate account of the Faculty Council meeting which he thought was one of the fairest pieces of reporting to appear in TTR. However, in the next issue, January 24th, there is an article completely contradicting in its basic direction the previous week's article in giving a piece of news that was then almost three week's old which said that Council approved with one exception the Rector's proposal for restructuring the Faculty, after having said the previous week that there was opposition to the report. As well in an adjacent article the resolution of Council about having the elections held within each of the four Divisions was reported as being a proposal from the Deans and Provost following consultation with the Rector. Provost Singer said that as a Council member he takes great exception to this kind of reporting. He considered the matter to be a very serious one because the issue had been raised by a number of non-Council members with him and more serious is the fact that the articles in TTR become the historical record. He asked that something be done about it.

The next speaker recommended strongly that the matter of the action of the Board of Governors be considered since it was now 5:25 p.m. and there was some urgency to do that as soon as possible, whereas the matter of the articles in TTR could be addressed at a later time.

Dean Roy said that he would like to give Ms. Verity a chance to reply to Provost Singer's statement.

There was a challenge to allowing a non-member to speak at 5:30 p.m.

Prof. Doyle challenged the quorum and the meeting was terminated.